Tait, Gordon (1991) *A re-assessment of the debate over sex education.* In: Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE), December 1991, Gold Coast, Queensland. (Unpublished)

A Re-Assessment of the Debate over Sex Education

Gordon Tait, QUT.

The intention of this paper is to call into question the apparent dichotomy between left and right wing positions concerning the implementation of sex education in Queensland Schools. By adopting a more historicised approach, it is suggested that these positions are part of dual and supplementary strategies which work through specific problematisations associated with youth. Accordingly, the emphasis should be shifted from generalised depictions of the adolescent/youth to more focused accounts, questioning how teaching children to manage their sex became a governmental imperative.

Setting up the problem

Almost all current texts tracing on the medicalisation of sex education are underpinned by two crucial domain assumptions: firstly, that youth should be understood in terms of self-expressive individuality and the development of the 'whole' person. Secondly, that these individuals possess an unrefined sexuality which requires both liberation and (then) benevolent regulation - a condition best brought about by the acquisition of 'legitimate' knowledges relating to sex. These suppositions are evident throughout the Queensland Department of Education publication entitled 'Human Relationships', in that ...

> ... the aims of sex education should be to indicate the immense possibilities for human fulfilment that sexuality offers, rather than primarily to control and suppress sex expression ... [i]

However, not only have recent theoretical developments problematised both these underlying assumptions, but also these arguments have limited utility for explaining the tenor of the controversies surrounding the introduction of sex education into Queensland Schools. Whereas most assessments of the inception of H.R.E. have revolved around a

simple political dichotomy of left and right, the subject proves to be considerably more complex if an historicised approach is employed.

The common rendering of the implementation of a sex education course is chiefly founded upon the knowledge that sex education only occurred after nearly twenty years of concerted lobbying, predominantly by teachers organisations such as the Queensland Teachers Union and the Queensland Council of State School Organisations[ii]. Consequently, the focus normally falls upon the actions of Rona Joyner's coalition of moral purity organisations - the Society to Outlaw Pornography (STOP) and the Committee Against Regressive Education (CARE). They had been instrumental in blocking an Australian Science Education Project (ASEP) unit entitled 'Males and Females' (one of forty others) in 1973; also, 'Man: A Course of Study' (MACOS) and 'Social Education Materials Project' (SEMP), in 1978. In spite of these setbacks, the pro-MACOS and SEMP lobbies were sufficiently powerful to trigger a response from the Premier the day after the banning of SEMP, in the form of a Committee of Inquiry into Education. This resulted in the Ahern Report in 1979; followed by the Male Report in 1981. Its recommendations lead to the introduction of the voluntary Personal Development Program (PDP) in 1984. In 1988, when Joh Bjelke-Peterson was deposed from the leadership of the National Party and hence the Queensland Premiership, the Cabinet (under the leadership of Mike Ahern) made provision for Human Relationships Education within the curriculum - one aspect of this course of study being sex education. As a result of this decision, a number of schools were invited to trial differing HRE models in 1989, and by 1991, they have become widespread in Queensland schools. There are now Graduate Diplomas available in HRE and the subject is also offered to undergraduate students as a teaching area.

By scrutinising the contours of this protracted debate, it would appear as if the two counterposing positions are clearly organised within familiar, well-delineated frameworks. The liberal arguments focus upon the inevitability of childhood sexuality, their 'natural curiosity' about sex and the belief that, in the words of the Ahern Report: 'if sex education does not take place in the classroom it will inevitably take place in the

playground'[iii]. This is contrasted against the conservative stance which stresses the importance of parents and doctors in regulating access to knowledge about sex, as part of a developmental understanding of childhood. However, simply dismissing right-wing arguments concerning sex education for being outmoded or irrational is to adopt a very selective approach in assessing the validity of their terms of debate. For example, it is not necessarily undesirable for parents to have the prerogative of classroom intervention, as this may well be considered laudable when addressing equity/cultural issues - such as those pertaining to gender and aboriginality. Conversely, the left-wing notion of fostering and rewarding self-expression in young people does not extend to actions which adversely affect others, as with bullying and sexual harassment.

In the face of these difficulties, perhaps a more productive route for the analysis to take would involve the investigation of how the debate came to be framed in terms of various co-existing components, such as the rights of young people regarding self-expression and their 'natural curiosity' about sexual matters, and the knowledges and practices underpinning the broader governmental objectives relating to reforming the sexual habits of the population. This is by no means intended as a comprehensive history of sex education in Queensland, constructed to replace existing comprehensive histories. Instead, it simply attempts to trace out some threads which lead out of the aforementioned tangle. This is to be accomplished, in part, by a brief analysis of some of the arguments and knowledges constitutive of the first concerted attempt to introduce sex education into Queensland schools during the First World War. By taking this historical detour, it becomes easier to challenge dominant perceptions of the current field of debate.

The emergence of 'sex education' as a governmental objective

In July 1916, the first Conference of State Directors of Education was held in Adelaide. They discussed the issue of sex education, concluding that some instruction on "sex physiology and hygiene" was needed. In

November 1916, the Workers Education Association in New South Wales asked, unsuccessfully, for the Queensland Department of Public Instruction to send delegates to a 'Sex Hygiene' conference, the aim being to 'help children avoid the pitfalls into which uncontrolled sexual instinct may lead them'[iv]. Likewise, the White Cross League, as a part of a coalition of purity organisations, also lobbied for sex education in schools, using White Cross League teachers. They had previously argued that immorality was widespread in Queensland and that this was a direct threat to the institutions of Christian marriage and family life. Much of the responsibility was placed upon sexual ignorance. They organised a short-lived series of lectures on sex education - an experiment soon discontinued by the then Minister for Public Instruction, Mr Herbert Hardacre.

One of the main reasons Hardacre gave for refusing to extend the experiment was a dispute over the methods of education to be employed, since there was by no means a consensus on this issue. Specifically, disagreement centred over whether the principle discourses circulating within sex education would be drafted by the medical institutions, which located sex within the realm of biology, or alternatively by the purity organisations, which posited sex as part of a morality to be reinforced by criminal legislation. Hardacre's decision was undoubtedly affected by popular discontent over the methods adopted by the purity movement, which was being widely voiced at this time. The Daily Mail, for example, criticised the criminalising approach to moral issues by stating that it was not possible "to make men and women better by shutting doors on them". Rather, the solution was to be found in positive education[v].

There are some relevant observations to be made here. Firstly, it is important to point out that the concept of formal sex education was fairly new at this time. Prior to the eighteenth century, the visibility of the sex act in the home ensured that its mechanics were understood by all, irrespective of age. It was only with the advent of certain architectural changes (such as the internal chimney and the corridor) that the potential even existed for sex to became a private matter[vi]. In his

book on the history of manners, Elias contrasts the attempts by Erasmus in 1522 and Von Raumer in 1857 to direct young people in the management of their sex. Whereas Erasmus regarded the task of educators as being pragmatic moral guidance (whether or not to have sex with servants, and so on), the increasing privatisation of sex had (in part) resulted in the displacement of this model, and its replacement with a pervasive and normative regimen of self-discipline. These two models have little in common.

Elias suggests that contemporary sexual regulation operates by constructing a 'socially patterned constellation of habits', through which it is possible to 'cultivate the socially required control over (the) behaviour of young people'[vii]. Mass schooling thereby became one of the most important and convenient mechanisms for implementing this form of governmental imperative. As Ian Hunter points out, the appearance of the modern classroom had the dual effect of regulating the behaviour and bodily demeanour of large numbers of children while at the same time supplying them with various skills and capacities[viii]. This regulation involved disciplinary technologies which not only sorted and classified individuals as part of the combined processes of individuation/normalisation, but also regulated the relations of 'time, bodies and forces'[ix].

Foucault argues that contemporary society is, in part, characterised by techniques for taking charge of the time of individual existences. This does not simply extend to the rigorous demarcation of the working day. Rather, it is positioning individuals in relation to the pervasive division of time - the organisation of time into successive or parallel segments; the arrangement these segments into a graded, cumulative series of increasing complexity; and the connecting of these series into an overall, developmental plan[x]. This is especially evident within contemporary schooling. As Foucault points out:

> ... disciplinary time ... was gradually imposed upon pedagogic practice - specialising the time of training and detaching it from adult time, from the time of mastery, arranging different stages ... drawing up

programmes ... qualifying individuals according to the way they pass through these series[xi].

This logic is evident in the recent guidelines for the implementation of Human Relation Education in Queensland schools. A ranked set of evolutive categories have been developed, such that Individuals are ranked within one of four classifications: early childhood, middle childhood, adolescence and young adulthood. Specific capacities are then allocated in relation to these categories - capacities against which knowledge about sex can be graded. Individuals in 'Early Childhood' display a 'natural curiosity" about sex and development, whereas individuals in 'Middle Childhood' are 'more consciously aware of their own uniqueness in their relationships with others'. Young people undergoing 'Adolescence' are 'developmentally ready for a formal study of their physiological and emotional changes', and those demarcated within 'Young Adulthood' develop a 'personal responsibility for relationships'[xii]. Thus, youth can be understood as part of the process of sub-dividing and ranking time within a segmented (but linear and teleological) model. It becomes an artefact of disciplinary methods which characterise and utilise individuals according to the stage in the series they are moving through - the intention of these techniques being to produce adults who can manage their own sex.

However, in 1916, this was not to be the case. Whereas this developmental approach seemed fitting for academic subjects ...

> the sexuality of school children was the object of disciplinary measures quite unlike those responsible for investing them with scholastic habits and capacities. Sexuality was governed by the norms originating in popular physiology, focussed on conserving the fragile energies of the body, and typified by the great anti-masturbation campaigns of the nineteenth century. These norms were embodied in the medical management of the school child's health and well-being and in the system of sport and games with its direct investment of the body, not in the classroom system[xiii].

Even as late as the Second World War, the Queensland Teachers Union were arguing against sex education in schools, suggesting that the sexuality of students was best dealt with in arenas other than the

classroom. Moreover, it was argued that the whole professional/ethical persona of the teacher would be placed at risk if they were required to instruct on sexual matters. It was not until the 1970's Queensland (with MACOS and SEMP) that sex became firmly entrenched within the sort of teleological model that mirrored other curriculum areas.

Generally then, sex education has not always been a problem. Indeed, it is only within the context of mass schooling that the idea of formal sex education has became thinkable. Furthermore, the placing of sex within a developmental pedagogic paradigm should not be seen as being inevitable, but an outcome contingent upon the kinds of knowledges currently circulating within disciplines such as education, psychology and medicine.

A further point of interest involves the belief that the 'child' was in danger from its 'sexual instinct', a situation best dealt with through education/regulation. This analysis posits the 'child' as a unitary object - the individual at the centre of a particular policy debate. This is not the case. The concept of the 'child' has been discontinuously constructed across a profusion of terrains and as such, it has neither a linear history nor a clearly demarcated present. Indeed, the 'child' itself initially came to be constructed as the object of knowledge at the intersection of specific educational, legal, medical and psychological problematisations. These would include, for instance, debates over legal definitions of consent and criminal liability, concerns over maladjustment, changes in strategies regarding juvenile delinquency and, of relevance to this paper, anxiety over public health and morality. It is from concerns such as these that notions of the 'adolescent' eventuated - a personage to which psychoanalysis had apportioned an active sexuality and upon which the 'uncontrolled sexual instinct' is grounded.

Although some concerns had been expressed over 'adolescence' during the latter part of the nineteenth century, these did not take on any coherent shape until the publication of G. Stanley Hall's massive text on the subject in 1904[xiv]. Hall's 'adolescent' was firmly rooted within the realm of biology, the book having a large number of chapters on subjects

such as physical growth, instincts and, as a result of his intellectual debt to Darwin, evolution. Not surprisingly, Hall's 'storm and stress adolescent' reflected most of the dominant theoretical understandings of sexuality of the time. Male adolescents were seen to develop in terms of strength and aggression, whilst the development of female adolescents was interpreted predominantly in terms of preparation for maternity. Thus, not only was sex posited as a powerful drive which 'asserts its mastery in field after field'[xv], but also this depiction, within the scientific arena of the biology lesson, reinforced the naturalness of gender divisions for young people. However, in spite of the pervasiveness of this category, retrospect would suggest that the 'adolescent' was simply the product of the intellectual milieu of the time in the field of psychology, along with Hall's own eclectic background, rather than anything more concrete. Bruce Smith suggests that the adolescent was:

> ... an amalgam of neurological research, literary romanticism and nineteenth-century American child rearing advice - an amalgam which did not succeed in forming its constituent elements into a coherent object. With the somatic base of much of Hall's evidence discredited ... the adolescent became abstracted as merely a figure of storm and stress, without any determinate content upon which educational policy or technique could be formulated[xvi].

However, it is this depiction of the 'adolescent' which still supports most of the rationales underlying not only sex education, but work in the field of youth in general. In the participants manual for the 1990 'Youth Sector Training Program', issued to youth workers in Queensland, adolescence is described as a period of exploration, confusion and guilt (particularly concerning sexuality); a time when 'their hormones are running wild' and when they need to express their sexual feelings[xvii].

As previously mentioned, this understanding of the adolescent is, to a large extent, the result of knowledges circulating within the psy-disciplines. Most obviously, it is psychoanalysis that propounds a model of the human psyche which, with minor theoretical variations, locates the 'biological urge to gain sexual pleasure' within the id[xviii]. This obedience to the pleasure principle is balanced against the rationally

constraining 'conscience' of the superego, and it is deemed to be the dictates of this feature of the unconscious which result in individuals burying their true sexual selves. Such a depiction of 'lost sexuality', supplemented by arguments about a sexually repressive society, have spawned the belief that a 'whole, self-fulfilled person' can only be achieved by exposing and removing their sexual hang-ups. This model is especially pertinent to the successful creation of a well-balanced adult. Anna Freud sums up the logic of this position by pathologising children ...

> who have built up excessive defences against their drive activities and are now crippled as a result, which acts as barriers against a normal maturation process of phase development. They are perhaps, more than any others, in need of therapeutic help to remove the inner restrictions and clear the path for normal development ...[xix]

Thus, it is increasingly the role of a whole network of experts in subjectivity (not just psychoanalysts, but educational and clinical psychologists, guidance counsellors, social workers etc.) to ensure the normal mental and sexual development of 'youth'. It is this assumption which provides one of the most important justifications for Human Relationships Education. Expert teachers can now direct groups in the techniques of social and sexual self-management necessary to become self-fulfilled and emotionally complete. The HRE guidelines for Queensland even articulate the need for 'the development of the whole person' and the need to help young people into 'fulfilling and harmonious personal and social relationships'[xx].

However, the knowledges of the psy-disciplines are still sexually normative, irrespective of their current depiction as leading the struggle against the structures of social and psychical repression. Their success is symptomatic, not only of the growth in the number of knowledges claiming professional expertise within this domain, but also of their value in the government of populations.

And yet, recent theoretical developments have problematised the all the central tenets of this position - not least of which being this essentialist, hydraulic account of sexuality. Michel Foucault rejects such a model,

suggesting instead that 'sexuality' is best located as an historical construct - an aggregation of disparate discourses concerning sex. Social interactionists have argued that sexual conduct is 'neither fixed in nature nor by the organs themselves'. Rather, it is the meaning assigned to that behaviour by the actors concerned that determines whether a situation or activity is sexual or not[xxi]. Feminist writers too have long questioned this model, understanding that placing sexuality within an essentialist framework necessarily inscribes a biological authorisation upon existing gender inequalities[xxii].

It was, in part, as a challenge to the scientifically legitimated essentialist arguments proclaiming the biological necessity of the link between sexuality and self-expression, that the White Cross League embarked upon a campaign to introduce sex education into Queensland schools. In a text entitled 'Purity and Impurity' the WCL's president Dr. Richard Arthur stated:

Give no heed to the infamous falsehoods of those who say it is necessary, and, therefore, right for a young man to sin[xxiii].

The WCL formed a part of a loose coalition of social reformers, widely referred to as the Purity Movement, but which included a heterogeneous selection of moral gatekeepers, feminists and socialists[xxiv]. It is the relationship between the feminists and the purity movement, as well as the normative nature of their involvement in sex education that is relevant here.

In general, the purity movement set out to reform the moral conduct of the population. Groups like the WCL, the YMCA and the YWCA, the Queensland Council for Public Morality, as well as women's organisations, such as the National Council for Women, the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Young Women's Christian Association, were all committed strategies based upon the family. In particular, the women's groups were interested in sex education as a means for challenging the Victorian double standard for sexual behaviour. By introducing a set of normative and corrective programs specifically with the intention of

reforming the sexual conduct of men, they hoped to improve the lot of women. That is, sex education was not to be about encouraging women to have the knowledge and confidence to 'express' their sexuality, it was about educating men into the habits of self-regulation. As such, and contrary to current characterisations, the tenor of the original feminist input into the sex education debate was normative as opposed to libratory.

Although the feminist alliance with the moral purity movement was fairly short lived, continued lobbying by feminists has ensured that courses such as Human Relationship Education have become imbued with imperatives concerning gender roles. This should not be looked upon as an inevitable and transcendental component of sex education. Such feminist dictates constitute just one element of a whole cluster of equally contingent concerns within the area, each of which has its own history.

Similar arguments can also be used to analyse a different element within the cluster that comprises sex education: that is, the role of the medical. More than in any other location, it seems both natural and logical to place sex education under the purview of science, and particularly medicine. However, as with the feminist impact of HRE, the medicalisation of sex should not be seen as a teleological inevitability. Rather, it has its own contingent history. It can therefore be traced as a strategy.

By the time of the First World War, the aforementioned alliance between Feminist and Moral Purity movements was no longer central in determining the tenor of sexual regulation. This coalition had been eclipsed by an increasing medicalisation of sex, which cordoned off 'sexuality' as, first and foremost, an object of scientific study. Within this framework, sexual normality and abnormality were to be medically isolated, mapped and policed. However, this by no means constituted a unified strategy. Both the eugenicists and the social hygienists operated within a scientific/medical paradigm, and yet had quite different agendas.

Although seemingly more predominant in England, the eugenic rhetoric of imperial decline concomitant upon bad genetic management also had currency in Queensland. The argument suggested that by letting the physically inferior underclasses breed at a greater rate than their genetic (and social) superiors, the physical quality of the stock in general would suffer. To negate this possibility, eugenicists argued that what was required was widespread sex education and, more importantly, a knowledge about contraception. In such a manner, those with more desirable characteristics could be encouraged to breed, while limiting the possibilities of the unfit.

On the other hand, social hygienists argued that society could be strengthened, not by genetic manipulation, but by improving factors such as diet, hygiene and education. Nikolas Rose suggests that this strategy involved shedding light upon the previously invisible recesses of society, sub-dividing what was there into manageable units (households), and transforming these units into mechanisms for producing healthy children.

> Such children would be clean, adequately clothed, fed according to medical norms and taught to eschew habits - ... sexual excess and promiscuity and so forth - which were now regarded as being not only morally undesirable but also damaging to health and constitution. The objective: to produce a population simultaneously physically, morally and mentally efficient. The mechanism: the reform of individuals by means of the link between the home and the school and the relay of the child[xxv].

Although the eugenicist and hygienist strategies appear to be in opposition, as Rose points out, they could both be combined into a single schema of administration involving the governmental techniques of normalisation/individuation addressed earlier[xxvi]. He cites the programmes of the Fabians as an example of how these two strategies could be combined into a single set of policies. These involved such measures as medical inspection of children, enforcement of national minimum standards, the 'searching out' and segregation of defectives, and the enforcement of the responsibilities of parenthood[xxvii].

The point here is to demonstrate that the current medicalisation of Human Relationships Education, with its interests in contraception, sexual hygiene and social responsibility, is no more a transcendental component of sex education than are the feminist imperatives outlined earlier. These medical dictates can also be traced to specific strategies of population management which have their own histories.

Conclusion

Jeffrey Minson suggests that the genealogical tradition, founded by Nietzsche, can be characterised by the debunking of 'cherished values by demonstrating their contingency and ignoble origins'[xxviii]. Contemporary sex education is one area vulnerable to such an analysis. The current problems within this field can be better understood when the various components are traced individually. This paper has looked at the governmental origins of sex education, how it became 'thinkable' within mass education, how the child/adolescent have been constructed as artefacts within such programmes, being endowed with a need to 'express their sexuality' in order to become a 'whole person', and how unrelated strategies, such as those associated with the psy-disciplines, feminism/purity and eugenics/social hygiene, have been instrumental in defining the terms of debate. It should not be surprising that these do not readily sit along side each other within a single model - and these are by no means the only relevant issues that could have been dealt with here.

Human Relationships courses are currently being lauded in some quarters as a panacea for all manner of personal and social ills. In others quarters it is deemed likely to exacerbate those problems. This paper has attempted to sidestep this dichotomising. Indeed, in spite of the manifest clarity and utility of these political positions, there are significant drawbacks in attempting to read the sex education debate solely in these terms. A good example of these limitations involves the effects of AIDS and the conspicuous necessity to modify the behaviour of young people. Both viewpoints have struggled to accommodate the

imperatives associated with this new variable. That is, neither 'liberal/ individual expressive' stance nor the 'conservative/ parental regulation' stance seems to be providing the necessary answers. Indeed, the controversy over AIDS provides an excellent example of how difficult it is to make political evaluations of 'sex education' as a coherent objective within mass education. Consequently, the intention of this paper has been to demonstrate that such apparent incoherencies in the field of sex education can be reorganised more usefully if key terms are seen as emerging from a selection of co-existing and supplementary strategies.

ENDNOTES

i. Queensland Department of Education Human Relationships (1976) p. 12.

ii. For more information on this period, see G. Logan, Sex Education in Queensland: a History of the Debate 1900-1980 Department of Education, Queensland (1980). Also, Gowers, A. & Scott, R. Fundamentals and Fundamentalists A.P.S.A. Monograph No. 22 (1980).

iii. Queensland Legislative Assembly, Fourth Interim Report of the Select Committee on Education in Queensland. Human Relationships. (1979) p. .

iv. 41919/30 October 1916, EDU/A 177 (QSA), cited in G. Logan, Sex Education in Queensland: a History of the Debate 1900-1980 Department of Education, Queensland (1980).

v. Daily Mail, 13 June 1917, cited in G. Logan, op. cit., p. 20.

vi.M. Foucault, 'Space, Knowledge, Power' in P. Rabinow (ed.) The Foucault Reader Penguin Books: New York (1984)

vii.Ibid., p. 188-189. However, Elias did not limit this model simply to regulating the sex of young people. He not only included other related issues, such as courting, marital fidelity, and techniques of sleeping and bathing, but also a wealth of other sets of behaviours relevant to the forming of 'civilised' persons - all of which is founded upon the notion of self-government.

viii.I. Hunter, 'Laughter and Warmth: Sex Education in Victorian Secondary Schools' Sex, Politics and Representation Local Consumption (1984) p. 69.

ix. M. Foucault, op. cit., (1977) p. 157.

x.Ibid., p. 157-158.

xi.Ibid., p. 159.

xii.Department of Education, op cit., p. 3.

7.I. Hunter, Op. cit., p. 69.

xiv. G. Stanley Hall Adolescence: Its Psychology, and its relation to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex Crimes, Religion and Education Appleton and Co.: New York 2 Volumes (1904).

xv. Ibid., Volume 1, p. Xl Xlll.

xvi. B. Smith, Discipline, From the Classroom to the Community I.C.P.S. Monograph (1989).

xvii.P. Crane, G. Embelton, S. Harris and M. Stokes. Participants Manual Youth Sector Training Program, Division of Youth: Queensland (1990), section 3.3.

xviii.H. Geiltman, Psychology Norton: New York (1981) p. 462.

xix.A. Freud, 'Adolescence.' in A. Winder and D. Angus (eds.) Adolescence: Contemporary Studies American Book: New York (1968) p. 14.

xx.Dept. Education, op. cit., p. 2.

xxi.J. Gagnon and W. Simon, Sexual Conduct Aldine Publishing Co.: Chicago (1973) p. 9.

xxii. For example, see. L. Coveney et. al., The Sexuality Papers: Male Sexuality and the Social Control of Women Hutchinson: London (1984).

xxiii.R.Arthur, Purity and Impurity. A booklet for lads Sydney: AWCL n.d. p.18. Cited in G. Logan, op. cit. p. 10.

xxiv. These alliances had initially been forged in great Britain within the Repeal Movement, formed with the primary intention of revoking the Contagious Diseases Acts of 1964, 1866 and 1869. These acts sought to control the spread of venereal diseases in garrison towns. However, in practice, they not only legitimated a double standard for male sexual behaviour, they also became a draconian mechanism for the control of young, working class women. The acts were finally repealed in 1886.

xxv. N. Rose, The Psychological Complex Routledge and Kegan Paul: London (1985) p. 85.

xxvi. Ibid., p. 85.

xxvii. S. Webb, Eugenics and the Poor Law: the minority report Eugenics Review, (1910), 2, p. 240-241. Cited in Rose, Ibid., p. 86.

xxviii. J. Minson, Genealogies of Morals Macmillan: London (1985) p. 7.